



International Tax

United States Tax Alert

October 28, 2015

Final and Temporary Rules Issued on Treatment of Dividend Equivalents under Section 871(m)

Contacts

Paul Epstein
pepstein@deloitte.com

Jeff O'Donnell
jodonnell@deloitte.com

Thomas Butera
tbutera@deloitte.com

On September 17, 2015, the U.S. Treasury Department (“Treasury”) and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released final and temporary regulations under Internal Revenue Code section 871(m) (the “Final Regulations” and the “Temporary Regulations”) which were published in the Federal Register on September 18, 2015¹. The Final Regulations generally retain the framework set forth in the proposed regulations released on December 5, 2013 (the “2013 Proposed Regulations”) by testing the “delta” of notional principal contracts (NPCs) and equity-linked instruments (ELIs) referencing U.S. equities to determine whether such contracts are characterized as “specified NPCs” or “specified ELIs” that give rise to “dividend equivalent” payments subject to U.S. gross basis tax and withholding tax under Chapters 3 (withholding) and 4 (FATCA) of the Internal Revenue Code. (For a discussion of the 2013 Proposed Regulations, see [U.S. International Tax alert dated December 6, 2013](#).)

Highlights of the Final Regulations include:

- Postponed effective date
- Delta standard increased from 0.7 to 0.8
- Delta tested only at issuance
- Division of contracts into “simple contracts” and “complex contracts” for purposes of delta testing
- Significant revisions to the definition of a qualified index, the rules for combined transactions, and the partnership look-through rule
- Reduction in the expected application of disqualified contingent interest treatment for debt issuances that reference actively traded property for purposes of portfolio interest treatment under section 871(h)(4)
- Update to timing of required withholding

¹ 80 Fed. Reg. 56865 (September 18, 2015).

The Temporary Regulations introduce a new Qualified Derivatives Dealer (QDD) regime to alleviate cascading gross basis tax and withholding tax on serial transactions. The QDD regime will replace the Qualified Securities Lender regime adopted in Notice 2010-46 and, for the first time, will coordinate securities lending and sale repurchase transactions with all equity-based transactions that are subject to section 871(m). The Temporary Regulations, when finalized, will limit relief from cascading gross basis tax to Qualified Intermediaries (QIs) who elect QDD status. Treasury and the IRS also announced they currently and preliminarily intend to eliminate the “Credit Forward” regime currently available to non-QIs and foreign persons who do not elect Qualified Securities Lender status with respect to their equity securities loans and sale repurchase transactions as defined under the 1997 final regulations. The IRS has requested comments on how a workable Credit Forward regime may be reliably implemented. The Temporary Regulations reserve on the Credit Forward regime and provide no proposed rule pending a final decision whether to adopt new rules or to abolish the Credit Forward regime altogether.

Observation: Unless a workable regime for implementing Credit Forward treatment in a chain of transactions is presented to the IRS in comments, non-QIs will be ineligible for relief from U.S. withholding on U.S. equity-based stock loans, sale repurchase transactions, specified NPCs and specified ELIs once the Temporary Regulations are finalized. Although the classes of transactions eligible for cascading relief will be expanded when the Temporary Regulations are finalized, the eligible foreign persons who may facilitate gross basis tax reduction will be significantly reduced.

Brief Background

Generally, dividends paid by a domestic corporation to a non-U.S. person are subject to a 30 percent rate of U.S. withholding tax, subject to rate reduction by treaty. Prior to the enactment of section 871(m), U.S. withholding tax generally was not imposed on income earned by a non-U.S. person on a swap or other derivative that referenced stock of a U.S. issuer. On March 18, 2010, in response to concerns that non-U.S. persons were able to avoid U.S. withholding tax on dividends through the use of equity swaps, Congress enacted section 871(m). *Four statutory categories* - The statutory provisions of section 871(m) treat dividend equivalent payments with respect to U.S. equity-based NPCs as U.S.-source dividend income subject to U.S. gross basis and withholding tax by providing four categories of “Specified NPCs”:

- (i) the long party transfers the underlying security to the short party in connection with entering into the NPC (“crossing-in”);
- (ii) the short party transfers the underlying security to the long party in connection with terminating the NPC (“crossing-out”);
- (iii) the underlying security is not readily tradable on an established securities market; or
- (iv) in connection with entering into the NPC, the underlying security is posted as collateral to the long party.

The statute also provided regulatory authority to identify other NPCs as Specified NPCs.

2012 Proposed Regulations

Treasury and the IRS initially issued temporary and proposed regulations on January 19, 2012 (the “2012 Proposed Regulations”). The 2012 Temporary Regulations extended the expiration period for the four statutory conditions that provide specified NPC status. Absent such extension, all U.S. equity-based NPCs would have been treated as specified NPCs and subject to gross basis tax as of September 14, 2012. In addition to the four statutory conditions that give rise to specified NPC status, the 2012 Proposed Regulations created seven categories of Specified NPCs and were proposed to apply to payments made on or after January 1, 2013. These were intended to replace the four statutory conditions (which were encompassed in the seven categories of the Proposed Regulations). Any contract that passed the tests of the 2012 Proposed Regulations would not be specified and would not be subject to dividend equivalent treatment. Hence, during that proposed period, only the four statutory categories provided specified NPC status. The Proposed Regulations also introduced rules for the treatment of ELIs that are not Notional Principal Contracts, and included rules for single payment and other non-NPC contracts that the IRS treated as bearing a substantial similarity to specified NPCs.

2013 Proposed Regulations

After a delayed effective date, the 2012 Proposed Regulations were withdrawn with the release of the 2013 Proposed Regulations. The four statutory categories were extended further during this new second proposed regulations period and remained the only identified conditions in effect for specified NPC status. The 2013 Proposed Regulations expanded the scope of section 871(m) to include ELIs and focused on an instrument’s delta (as defined below) to determine if a contract was to be treated as “specified” and subject to the sourcing rule of section 871(m). Potential non-specified ELI treatment that was apparently granted in the 2012 Proposed Regulations pending their finalization (e.g. with respect to certain Single Stock Futures) was removed and subjected to more certain specified ELI treatment under the new delta test in the 2013 Proposed Regulations. Other equity derivatives such as certain options that might expire out of the money were also seemingly subjected to specified ELI status by the 2013 delta test. These problems gave rise to an extended notice and comment period that was due to expire at the end of 2014 and was extended an additional year to the end of 2015. Notice 2014-14 was issued in March 2014 extending the announced effective date for ELIs issued 90 days after the regulations were published as final in the Federal Register. This effective date has not been followed in the new Final Regulations discussed below and has been postponed to a later alternative effective date depending on whether the ELI is issued in 2016 or in 2017 (or later).

New Final Regulations

As stated above, the Final Regulations generally retain the framework set forth in the 2013 Proposed Regulations, but with substantial revisions. In particular, any payment that references the payment of a dividend from an “underlying security” pursuant to an NPC or ELI with a delta of 0.8 or greater (a “Specified NPC” or “Specified ELI”) is treated as a dividend from sources within the United States. For this purpose, a payment is any U.S. dividend payment that is included in calculating a net payment.² In addition, an “underlying security” is an interest in an entity that could give rise to a U.S.-source dividend if a payment were made with respect to such interest. In addition, the Temporary Regulations (with

² Section 871(m)(5) defines a “payment” as including any gross amount that is used in computing any net amount that is transferred to or from the taxpayer.

corresponding proposed regulations) introduce new concepts where Treasury and the IRS have requested comments.

Effective Dates

The Final Regulations contain a staggered effective date provision:

- Transactions issued on or before December 31, 2015 are grandfathered from the Final Regulations.
- For transactions issued on or after January 1, 2016 and on or before December 31, 2016 (i.e., issued in 2016), the Final Regulations apply to payments made on or after January 1, 2018.
- For transactions issued on or after January 1, 2017, the Final Regulations apply to payments made on or after January 1, 2017.
- The four statutory conditions remain in force and apply to all payments on all current and future contracts. The effective dates discussed above apply to the new rules and provide supplemental rules to the four statutory categories for determining the specified NPC and specified ELI status of an instrument.

Accordingly, while the Final Regulations become fully effective in 2017, transactions entered into as early as January 1, 2016 and as late as December 31, 2016 may become subject to U.S. withholding tax under section 871(m), albeit only with respect to payments in 2018 or later. Taxpayers thus need to consider the impact of the Final Regulations on long-dated contracts entered into in 2016 (i.e., with a term extending into 2018). Further, taxpayers will continue to remain subject to common-law assertions by the IRS that a non-U.S. person is the owner of a U.S. equity for tax purposes (and thus subject to U.S. withholding tax on U.S.-source dividends) notwithstanding the form of the transaction as a derivative on the underlying equity.

Observation: The factual conditions that most often are evaluated by the IRS for assigning tax ownership to a non-U.S. person are also those that already give rise to specified NPC status under the four statutory conditions that will continue to apply as final regulations.³

Delta

While the Final Regulations retain the concept of “delta” from the 2013 Proposed Regulations, the Final Regulations provide a number of important changes in this regard. First, contracts are characterized as either simple contracts or complex contracts. Second, the delta for a potential section 871(m) transaction is determined only when the potential section 871(m) transaction is issued (as defined below), and is not recalculated in conjunction with a secondary market acquisition or dividend payment. Third, the delta standard was raised from 0.7 to 0.8 for purposes of determining whether a potential section 871(m) transaction is subject to section 871(m) (i.e., for purposes of determining if a contract is considered to be a Specified NPC or a Specified ELI).

Simple Contracts

³ See LMSB Industry Directive on Total Return Swaps Used to Avoid Dividend Withholding Tax, January 10, 2010. LMSB Control No. LMSB-4-1209-044, Impacted I.R.M. 4.51.5. Section 871(m) was enacted in March 2010, soon after this LMSB Industry Directive was issued.

Generally, a simple contract is a NPC or ELI that has payments calculated by reference to a single, fixed number of shares in an underlying security that can be determined at issuance and that has a single maturity or exercise date (including American-style options). As stated in the preamble, it is expected that most NPCs and ELIs will be simple contracts. For simple contracts, “delta” is defined as the ratio of the change in fair market value of the contract to a “small change” in the fair market value of the underlying security referenced by the contract. Delta must be determined in a commercially-reasonable manner, and where delta is calculated for non-tax business purposes such calculation will generally be used for purposes of section 871(m). The Final Regulations implicitly retain the concept that contracts with a constant delta are in scope by providing detail on how to determine how many shares of an underlying security are provided for in the contract.

As stated above, delta is determined at the time of issuance of a contract. For this purpose, a contract is considered to be issued when it is entered into, purchased, or otherwise acquired at its inception or original issuance. A modification of an outstanding contract that results in a realization event under section 1001 for all parties would also result in a new issuance for purposes of section 871(m) and thus would require delta to be tested at such time.

Generally, delta is determined separately for each underlying security if the contract references more than one underlying security. To help simplify the delta calculation, the Final Regulations allow for a short party that hedges a basket of 10 or more underlying securities with an exchange-traded security that references substantially all of the securities in the contract to use such hedge security to determine the delta of the basket of securities (rather than calculating the delta of each underlying security referenced in the contract).

Observation: While the Final Regulations do not explicitly exclude convertible debt from section 871(m), the embedded option within a typical convertible debt instrument has a delta of less than 0.8 at issuance, thus effectively excluding typical convertible debt instruments from section 871(m), unless a modification of an outstanding debt instrument resulted in a deemed “new” issuance.

Observation: Because the purchase of a listed option is typically viewed as the issuance of a new option, it is likely that delta will need to be tested at the time of acquisition of a listed option. In such case, because stock price movements will affect delta, it is possible that if a taxpayer purchases listed options with identical terms on different days, one such listed option could be a Specified ELI because delta was greater than 0.8 on the date of acquisition, while the identical listed option purchased on a different day could be out of scope for purposes of section 871(m).

Complex Contracts

A complex contract is a NPC or ELI that is not a simple contract. A structured note with a formulaic return is an example of a complex contract. The Temporary Regulations set forth a “substantial equivalence” test to determine if a complex contract is a section 871(m) transaction. The substantial equivalence test is a mathematical formula designed to determine whether the complex contract substantially replicates the economic performance of the underlying security. Commenters on the 2013 Proposed Regulations suggested this test which compares the complex contract and its initial hedge to a comparable simple contract with a delta of 0.8 and its initial hedge. For this purpose, the initial hedge

is the number of shares of the underlying security that the short party would need to fully hedge a NPC or ELI. A complex contract is a Specified NPC or Specified ELI if the expected change in value of the complex contract and its initial hedge is equal to or less than the expected change in value of the simple contract benchmark and its initial hedge, calculated at the time the complex contract is issued. The IRS and Treasury have requested comments on this test.

Dividend-Equivalent Payments

Generally, a “dividend equivalent” is any payment that references the payment of a dividend from an underlying security pursuant to (i) a securities lending or sale-repurchase transaction, (ii) a Specified NPC or Specified ELI, or (iii) any substantially similar payment, which is defined in the final regulations as a payment by the payor of the payee’s gross basis tax on a dividend-equivalent payment that is treated as a grossed-up dividend. It remains unclear whether the term “substantially similar payment” may include determinations made by the Secretary on examination with respect to facts and circumstances not defined in the regulations, or whether the definition provided is the full scope of “substantially similar” treatment for purposes of section 871(m)(2)(C), from which the term is derived.

A dividend equivalent includes any amount that references an actual or estimated payment of a U.S.-source dividend regardless of whether the reference is explicit or implicit. An implicit dividend includes a contract such as a forward or regulated future whose price is adjusted by reference to an estimated dividend amount, including a dividend amount that has not been declared at the time the contract is issued. Accordingly, even a price-only contract could result in a dividend equivalent payment. A dividend equivalent also includes any payment by a withholding agent made in satisfaction of a tax liability of the long party with respect to a dividend equivalent. The short party to a section 871(m) transaction is treated as paying an actual dividend amount per-share unless the short party identifies in writing a reasonable estimated dividend amount upon issuance of the transaction.

A dividend equivalent on a simple contract is equal to (i) the amount of the per-share dividend, multiplied by (ii) the number of shares referenced in the contract, multiplied by (iii) the applicable delta of the simple contract measured at issuance. A dividend equivalent on a complex contract equals (i) the amount of the per-share dividend, multiplied by (ii) the number of shares that make up the initial hedge of the complex contract. The amount of a dividend equivalent is determined on the earlier of the record date or the day prior to the ex-dividend date for the relevant dividend. In practice, with unusual exception generally only applicable to special dividend declarations or to due bills transactions, the day prior to the ex-dividend date for a relevant dividend will precede the dividend record date.

If a section 871(m) transaction references long positions in a basket of more than 25 underlying securities, the short party may treat all of the dividends on the basket as paid on the last day of the calendar quarter. Furthermore, if a section 871(m) transaction references the same underlying securities as an index or other security for which there is a publicly-available quarterly dividend yield, the per-share dividend amount for the section 871(m) transaction can be calculated by using the publicly-available dividend yield with an adjustment for any special dividends.

Observation: Because a dividend equivalent payment may occur even for implied dividends in a contract, the Final Regulations create the possibility of

cashless withholding requirements. For example, U.S. withholding tax could be required for a dividend equivalent payment with respect to a price-only contract where the offshore long party owes an amount to the short party (i.e., the stock price declined but dividends were paid during the term of the contract). As another example, U.S. withholding tax could be required upon the lapse of a call option held by a non-U.S. person. In this regard, we note that the short-term exception for contracts with a term of one year or less included in the 2013 Proposed Regulations (which would have prevented this result in many circumstances) was not included in the Final Regulations.

Timing for Withholding

A withholding agent is not obligated to withhold on a dividend equivalent payment until the later of (i) the date the amount of the dividend equivalent is determined (i.e., the earlier of the date that is the record date of the dividend or the day prior to the ex-dividend date with respect to the dividend), or (ii) the date a payment occurs on the Specified NPC or Specified ELI. For this purpose, a payment occurs if money or other property is paid to or by the long party, or the long party disposes of the Specified NPC or Specified ELI. This rule in the Final Regulations provides some relief as compared to the 2013 Proposed Regulations, which required withholding at the time a dividend equivalent was determined, regardless of whether a payment occurred at such time.

Observation: No guidance was provided for determining withholding on contracts where the cash is provided for the acquisition of the contract but the withholding agent would not ordinarily be in a position to know the estimated dividend that was assumed in the pricing of the contract. Contractual arrangements will likely need to be expanded so that long parties will be required to provide dividend estimates to their brokers who acquire contracts for undisclosed principals and for contracts that settle on regulated exchanges.

Qualified Index

As a safe harbor for potential section 871(m) transactions, a “qualified index” is not treated as an underlying security; therefore, a NPC or ELI that references a qualified index is not subject to section 871(m). The Final Regulations have updated the definition of a qualified index from the 2013 Proposed Regulations. Importantly, the determination of whether an index is a qualified index will be made on the first business day of each calendar year and applies to all potential section 871(m) transactions issued during that calendar year.

A qualified index is an index that:

- (i) references at least 25 component securities (including foreign securities);
- (ii) contains only long positions (with a de minimis exception for up to five percent short positions, taking into account short positions held by the taxpayer or a related party);
- (iii) references no single underlying security representing more than 15 percent of the index;
- (iv) references no five or fewer component underlying securities that together represent more than 40 percent of the index;
- (v) is modified or rebalanced only according to publicly-stated, predefined criteria (which may require interpretation by the index provider);
- (vi) did not provide an annual dividend yield in the preceding calendar year

that is greater than 1.5 times the annual dividend yield of the S&P 500 Index for the same period; and

- (vii) is traded through futures or option contracts on an SEC-registered exchange, CFTC-designated domestic board of trade, or, in certain circumstances, a foreign board or exchange that is a “qualified board or exchange” pursuant to section 1256(g)(7)(C) or satisfies certain other criteria.

As a safe harbor provision to the qualified index rule, an index is a qualified index if the referenced component underlying securities in the aggregate comprise 10 percent or less of the weighting of the component securities in the index (i.e., the index provides 10 percent or less U.S. equity exposure). Additionally, if a potential section 871(m) transaction references stock in an exchange-traded fund or other security that tracks a qualified index, the potential section 871(m) transaction will be treated as referencing a qualified index.

Combined Transactions

For purposes of section 871(m), two or more transactions referencing the same underlying security can be treated as a single transaction for purposes of calculating delta if they are entered into “in connection” with each other and if, when combined, they replicate the economics of a transaction which would be a section 871(m) transaction (i.e., satisfies the delta test). The Final Regulations provide two presumptions allowing short party brokers to presume that transactions were not entered into “in connection” with each other (absent actual knowledge): (i) the long party holds or reflects the transactions in separate accounts maintained by the short party, or (ii) the transactions are entered into two or more business days apart.

The Commissioner will presume that a long party did not enter into two or more transactions in connection with each other if such transactions are properly reflected on separate trading books, or such transactions are entered into two or more business days apart. However, the Commissioner may rebut these presumptions. On the other hand, the Commissioner will presume that transactions *are* entered into in connection with each other if the transactions are entered into less than two business days apart and reflected on the same trading book. In this case, the long party may rebut this presumption.

Partnership Look-Through Rule

Subject to the look-through rule set forth below that was expanded by the Final Regulations, a contract referencing a partnership interest will not be a section 871(m) transaction. The assets of a partnership will be treated as referenced by a potential section 871(m) contract referencing the partnership interest, however, if (i) the partnership carries on a trade or business of dealing or trading in securities; (ii) the partnership holds “significant investments in securities;” or (iii) the partnership holds, directly or indirectly, an interest in a lower-tier partnership that satisfies one of the first two tests. For purposes of the second test, the phrase “significant investments in securities” means that either (i) 25 percent or more of the value of the partnership’s assets consist of underlying securities or potential section 871(m) transactions, or (ii) the value of the underlying securities or potential section 871(m) transactions is equal to or greater than \$25 million.

Observation: Consideration should be given to investments such as swaps on Master Limited Partnerships (MLPs) that utilize C corporation blockers. While such corporate holdings may represent a very small percentage of the MLP’s investments and activities, it is likely that such a blocker entity could have a value

in excess of \$25 million, thus creating a potential section 871(m) transaction.

Reporting Requirements

Generally, a broker or dealer that is a party to a potential section 871(m) transaction will have the obligation to determine and report delta at issuance of the transaction, as well as the timing and amount of any dividend equivalents. If both parties are brokers or dealers, or neither party is a broker or dealer, the short party will have the reporting obligations. The determination will generally be binding on the other relevant parties and requested information must be reported within a reasonable time, not to exceed 10 business days. The Final Regulations are intended to make clear that agents and intermediaries are considered parties to the transaction for this purpose.

Other Rules

The Final Regulations provide guidance on overlapping rules with other Code sections in two instances:

- (i) **Section 305 transactions** - A dividend equivalent under section 871(m) is reduced by any amount treated as a dividend pursuant to section 305 with respect to the same underlying security. In this instance, both the section 871(m) and 305 rules apply concurrently, with section 305 treatment taking precedence to common dividend treatment amounts.
- (ii) **Contingent debt instruments** - The portfolio interest exemption under section 871(h)(4) does not apply to any portion of interest paid on a debt obligation if such payment is treated as a dividend equivalent. However, the final regulations will only apply to debt instruments whose interest is determined by reference to the performance of U.S. equities where such debts have a delta of 0.80 or higher on the debt issuance date. While technically this could apply for the first time to contingent debt instruments that reference actively traded U.S. stocks, Treasury and the IRS state in the preamble to the Final Regulations that they expect this rule to apply in limited circumstances. Still, offering documents for contingent debt issuances will likely require some detail about the delta on the issuance date to enhance marketability as qualified portfolio debt instruments.

Exceptions to 871(m) Treatment

The Final Regulations also provide relief from section 871(m) in certain other circumstances:

- **Mergers & acquisitions:** If one or more persons, including the long party, are required to acquire underlying securities representing more than 50 percent of the entity issuing the underlying securities, the transaction is not a section 871(m) transaction.
- **Equity-based compensation:** In general, equity-based compensation for services of a nonresident alien individual is not a dividend equivalent for section 871(m) purposes.
- **Due bills:** Payments made pursuant to a due bill are not dividend-equivalent payments for section 871(m) purposes.
- **Annuities, endowments and domestic life insurance company contracts:** The Temporary Regulations also provide that there is no dividend equivalent associated with a payment pursuant to the terms of an

annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract issued by a domestic insurance company. The IRS and Treasury are still considering such contracts issued by foreign life insurance companies, but provide current relief from section 871(m).

Anti-Abuse Rule

The Final Regulations contain an anti-abuse provision that enables the Commissioner to treat any payment made with respect to a transaction as a dividend equivalent if the transaction was entered into with a principal purpose of avoiding withholding under section 871(m). The regulations provide no illustration of how this rule might apply, including whether the anti-abuse rule might apply where a delta is near, but not equal to or greater than, the 0.80 delta on the contract issuance date.

Qualified Derivatives Dealers

The Temporary Regulations under Reg. §1.1441-1T(e) set forth a new regime intended to prevent cascading withholding by reason of section 871(m) for “qualified derivatives dealers” (QDDs). The new regime would expand and replace the regime for qualified securities lenders (QSLs) set forth in Notice 2010-46. Currently, the QSL regime applies only to U.S.-based stock loans defined in section 1058 (or any similar transaction) and equity sale repurchase transactions. The regime is currently available to (i) foreign banks, custodians, broker-dealers and clearing organizations that are subject to regulatory supervision by a governmental authority in the jurisdiction in which they were created or organized, and (ii) where such entity is regularly engaged in a trade or business that includes borrowing the securities of domestic corporations from, and lending to, the entity’s unrelated customers. The entity must be either a Qualified Intermediary (QI) or subject to tax under section 7602. Since Notice 2010-46 was issued, the IRS National Office has regularly explained that they intended the reference to section 7602 to be limited to U.S. trades or businesses of foreign corporations and to CFCs of U.S. parent corporations so that the summons power under section 7602 could be exercised over such foreign operations who are not already operating under a QI agreement. However, they have not enforced the reference to section 7602 on that basis and have acknowledged that such reference to section 7602 in the Notice was overbroad and in need of amendment. Foreign QIs were also enabled to include securities loans and sale repurchase transactions the entity transacted as principal, and were not limited only to those it already was eligible to handle in custody. Existing QI agreements were treated as amended by the Notice to accommodate this limited class of principal transactions.

To explain the changes made to QSLs in the forthcoming QDD regime that will replace it, a brief explanation of the scope of eligible taxpayers and limited transactions to which the QSL regime is available is provided below. A brief discussion of the current Credit Forward regime available to non-QSLs is also provided, followed by a comparison of the changes to the eligible taxpayers and eligible transactions the QDD regime will adopt.

QSL regime

The QSL regime, adopted on May 20, 2010 by Notice 2010-46, enabled the eligible foreign entity to elect to act as a primary withholding agent when the foreign entity regularly acted as a principal borrower from, and lender of U.S. stocks to, unrelated customers. Accordingly, a U.S. borrower of stocks could pay a substitute dividend to a foreign QSL and not withhold as it would if it were paying a QI. In turn, the QSL could make an offsetting substitute dividend

payment to a lender and withhold based on the stock lender's gross basis rate of tax, if any, with the United States. Under the QSL regime, for the first time, a foreign hedge fund could borrow a U.S. stock from a QSL without having to withhold on the substitute payment made to the QSL if the QSL was situated in a jurisdiction with a higher rate of tax than the hedge fund borrower. Notice 97-66 was repealed with the implementation of the QSL regime. As a result, taxpayers' arguments for claiming exemption under Notice 97-66 with respect to substitute payments to lenders in jurisdictions with the same rate as the borrower, were no longer available as of September 14, 2010 when the repeal of Notice 97-66 and the commencement of the Notice 2010-46 regime became effective. However, under Notice 2010-46, the QSL may borrow from a U.S. person (including its U.S. parent or affiliate broker dealer) and pay no withholding tax on its offsetting substitute payment. Accordingly, the QSL's offsetting transactions enable it to lend into the United States to a U.S. person or U.S. trade or business of a foreign person, and also to borrow from a U.S. person (or U.S. trade or business of a foreign person) without having any gross basis tax imposed on the substitute payment received. Such treatment was not previously available, even under Notice 97-66, which only applied to foreign-to-foreign stock loans and sale repurchase transactions.

The QSL regime is limited to transactions where the QSL obtains and/or transfers the physical U.S. stock through a stock loan under section 1058 or a similar transaction and to a sale repurchase transaction. The QSL regime does not grant exemption from gross basis tax or withholding with respect to dividends on the actual stock owned by the QSL on the ex-dividend date, or any specified NPCs or specified ELLs.

“Credit Forward” treatment of non-QSLs

Foreign taxpayers that did not elect into the QSL regime either as a QI or a non-QI can avail themselves of an alternative “Credit Forward” regime to reduce and prevent cascading of excessive gross basis tax in accordance with the legislative goals of section 871(m)(6). It requires that the Credit Forward treatment apply only to dividends received and substitute payments received with respect to transactions in a series of stock loans or sale repurchase transactions. The Credit Forward regime is not available to prevent cascading of gross basis tax or withholding with respect to:

- dividend-equivalent payments received or paid by the non-QSL with respect to specified NPCs or specified ELLs; or
- dividend-equivalent payments received or paid by the non-QSL with respect to stock loans and sale repurchase transactions where the withholding in a series of transactions is not substantiated

The Credit Forward regime is not fully realized in Notice 2010-46 and does not, for instance, resolve the treatment of excess withholding to a foreign person who in turn may pay a substitute dividend payment to another foreign person in a jurisdiction with a greater rate of tax. For instance, if a UK resident is eligible for a 15% rate of gross basis tax but is withheld 30% on a substitute dividend, the regime does not appear to prohibit the full 30% from being credited forward against another foreign lender in a non-treaty jurisdiction where the gross basis rate is 30%. This approach created problems of proving and timely reporting the eligible gross basis tax for a particular year after all refund claims are made by persons subject to a treaty-reduced tax rate, and then proving the scope of available withholding for offsetting transactions. For these reasons, among other

problems of proving withholding in a series of transactions, Treasury and the IRS have proposed to eliminate the Credit Forward regime, but have solicited comments on how a workable regime could be implemented. If the Credit Forward regime is eliminated with finalization of the Temporary Regulations, the only eligible taxpayers who will be able to facilitate reduced cascading of gross basis tax will be QIs who are eligible entities and who make QDD elections under a revised QI agreement that will be effective for years ending after December 31, 2016.

The forthcoming QDD regime

Under the Temporary Regulations, only a QI may elect to be a QDD if it is (i) a dealer in securities subject to regulatory supervision in the jurisdiction where it is organized or operates; (ii) a bank subject to regulatory supervision in the jurisdiction in which it was organized or operates that issues potential section 871(m) transactions to customers and receives dividends or dividend equivalent payments; and (iii) wholly-owned affiliates of banks that are regulated in the jurisdiction where it is organized or operates. Custodians and clearing organizations are no longer eligible entities unless the IRS intends that they should be encompassed by the QI regime for acting solely in a non-beneficial owner capacity. It will then be expected that the QDD regime should also apply to transactions where the QI does not act as principal - but clarification should likely be sought during the regulations' notice and comment period. The reference to taxpayers that "are subject to audit under section 7602" is eliminated, and foreign entities with U.S. branch operations and CFCs of U.S. parents will no longer be eligible even if they are regulated banks or dealers in securities *unless* they also are QIs acting under the forthcoming Revenue Procedure that will be issued for all periods beginning after December 31, 2016.

Observation: The addition of affiliates of regulated banks as eligible entities does not appear to require that the affiliate be resident in the same jurisdiction as that in which the regulated bank or securities dealer is organized and subject to regulatory supervision. Therefore, as long as the affiliate is a QI where it does operate, its affiliation with a regulated bank or dealer in securities that is subject to regulatory supervision where it is organized or operates appears to qualify the entity for the QDD regime. Clarification should also be sought during the notice and comment period of the regulations concerning the scope of entities in a multinational group of companies that will be eligible for the QI regime, including whether, for instance, a foreign investment company may qualify to enter into a QI agreement so long as it is affiliated with the necessary regulated entity, and whether it must be organized in the same country or may be organized in another country.

Eligible transactions in the QDD regime

The QDD regime does expand the eligible transactions to include all transactions that may give rise to a dividend equivalent payment under section 871(m). Accordingly, and for the first time, a foreign QI acting in a principal capacity may combine a stock borrowing with a specified equity derivative and avoid withholding. For instance, if a foreign securities dealer borrows a stock in a stock loan transaction to deliver in a short sale it entered into with a customer, and it hedges such short sale with a specified ELI such as an option or a single stock future, the foreign dealer that has a QDD election under a QI agreement in place with the IRS as of January 1, 2017 may have no gross basis tax or withholding imposed on the specified ELI, and should only have to withhold on its substitute payment with respect to its stock borrowing if the stock lender is a beneficial

owner in a jurisdiction that has a gross basis rate of tax with the United States. If the stock lender is a U.S. person, or a qualified exempt person, then the QDD regime should eliminate all gross basis tax for properly-documented payments on the series of transactions. In contrast, the QSL regime does not cover dividend equivalent payments with respect to specified ELIs, and cascading gross basis tax relief is not yet available for this type of transaction.⁴

Credit Forward regime

The Credit Forward regime is reserved in the Temporary Regulations and no rule is adopted in the accompanying proposed regulations issued with the Temporary rules. For the time being, the Credit Forward regime that is applicable only to stock loans and sale repurchase transactions and substantially similar transactions remains in place, but may be gone after January 1, 2017 unless some approach is adopted. No regulation has yet been written for the Credit Forward regime under section 871(m). The only understanding of its application is stated in Notice 2010-46 (which will be rescinded and replaced by the QDD regime). The problems identified by Treasury and the IRS in the preamble to the new regulations necessitate specific industry action to introduce a reliable and verifiable system that may be adopted in withholding and reporting regulations.

Observation: Even for eligible taxpayers that elect QDD status, withholding imposed on a QI might not be eligible for credit forward treatment with respect to offsetting dividend equivalent payments the QI must make, unless the forthcoming QI agreement so provides.

A public hearing is scheduled for January 15, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in the IRS National Office auditorium in Washington, D.C. Anyone wishing to present at the hearing must submit an outline of topics by December 27, 2015.

⁴ The proposed 2013 regulations provided a limited related-party broker dealer exception for hedge transactions, but this provision was not effective or integrated with transactions to which Notice 2010-46 applies.

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee (“DTTL”), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as “Deloitte Global”) does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about for a more detailed description of DTTL and its member firms. Certain services are not available to attest clients under the rules and regulations of public accounting.

Deloitte provides audit, consulting, financial advisory, risk management, tax and related services to public and private clients spanning multiple industries. With a globally connected network of member firms in more than 150 countries and territories, Deloitte brings world-class capabilities and high-quality service to clients, delivering the insights they need to address their most complex business challenges. Deloitte’s more than 220,000 professionals are committed to making an impact that matters.

This communication contains general information only, and none of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related entities (collectively, the “Deloitte Network”) is, by means of this communication, rendering professional advice or services. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your finances or your business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser. No entity in the Deloitte Network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this communication.

© 2015. For information, contact Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited.